

It seems evident that even if one were to accept the Examiner's arguments, there is nothing in either of the references that enables the video representation to be utilized to receive a request to playback one of the encoded audio communications. For example, *Gurbani* talks about allowing the user to select one of the records to enable the user to dial back a number on the retrieved list. But nothing in *Gurbani* suggests using the list to enable the recollection of a recorded audio communication. Since *McAllister* does not apparently show such a video representation (as conceded by the Examiner in the second paragraph of page three), it seems that the combination cannot render claim 6 obvious.

For the same reason, new claim 17 patentably distinguishes over the art.


Claims 21 and 22 were added pursuant to the suggestion on page 5 of the office action.

In view of these remarks the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1/7/03



\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

## APPENDIX

22. (New) The method of claim 6 including generating a video representation in the form of a user selectable icon.

23. (New) The article of claim 17 further storing instructions that if executed enable a processor based system to generate a video representation in the form of a user selectable icon.